

Appln. No.: 09/838,147  
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The non-final Office Action of September 21, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 17, 21-28, 35, and 39-41 have been amended so as to place the referenced claims in preferred form. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-41 are pending.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of the allowability of claims 1-20 and 29-41. As noted above, the amendments made to claims 1, 17 and 35 place the referenced claims in a preferred form without modifying the nature of the claimed subject matter. As such, Applicants submit that the Office is not required to perform supplementary, substantive examination of claims 1, 17, and 35 in view of the amendments to said claims.

***Interview Summary***

Applicants' representative(s) would like to express their appreciation for the time taken by Examiner Contee to discuss the status of the application via a telephonic interview on September 12, 2007. Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, Applicants' representative(s) agree with the substance of the Examiner Interview Summary provided with the Office Action.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 21, 22, 24-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,291 to Lee et al. ("Lee"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 21 recites, among other features, "a controller configured to receive user-selected information related to a resource via a wireless communication network and to send the resource related information to a wireless terminal . . . wherein the apparatus comprises a wireless communication terminal." The Office Action at page 2 alleges that Lee at col. 5, line 14 – col. 6, line 21 discloses the above-noted features. Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited passage in Lee (or any passage in Lee, for that matter) teaches or suggests the above-noted features. Lee is directed to a device for data communications between a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) terminal and a WAP server. See Lee, Abstract. More specifically, Lee at col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 2 and Fig. 5 describes an interworking function (IWF) unit 54 that has a

Appln. No.: 09/838,147  
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007

mapping table used for connecting an identification number of a specific WAP terminal to a WAP server; the IWF unit 54 also includes an additional mapping table which is used for finding the corresponding WAP terminal during reception of data from a WAP server. Thus, even assuming (without admitting) that the identification numbers disclosed in Lee could appropriately be analogized to the user-selected information related to a resource as recited in claim 21, Lee is silent with respect to any teaching or suggestion of sending the resource related information from an apparatus, wherein the apparatus comprises a wireless communication terminal, to a wireless terminal. Instead, the identification numbers are conveyed to the *IWF unit 54*, which in turn serves to map the WAP terminals (e.g., WAP terminals 50, 52) to corresponding *WAP servers* (e.g., WAP servers 56, 58). See Lee at col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 2 and Fig. 5. Thus, Lee fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features as recited in claim 21, and claim 21 is allowable over Lee for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, claim 21 recites “wherein the controller is further arranged to negotiate a connection *with the wireless terminal* and subsequently to receive the information over the connection.” For substantially similar reasons as discussed above, Lee does not disclose a controller (within the recited apparatus that is comprised of a wireless communication terminal) that is arranged to negotiate a connection with a wireless terminal. At most, Lee at col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 22 describes connecting WAP terminals 50, 52 to WAP servers 56, 58. Lee is silent with respect to one of WAP terminals 50, 52 (e.g., WAP terminal 50) arranging a connection with the other WAP terminal (e.g., WAP terminal 52). As such, Lee fails to disclose at least this additional feature recited in claim 21, and claim 21 is therefore allowable over Lee for at least this additional reason.

Independent claim 25 recites features similar to those noted above with respect to claim 21. Claim 25 is allowable over Lee for at least similar reasons.

Claims 22, 24, 26, and 28, which each depend from at least one of claims 21 and 25, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Appln. No.: 09/838,147  
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007

Claims 23 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0123335 to Luna et al. ("Luna"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding whether the combination of Luna and Lee is proper, Luna fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Lee with respect to independent claims 21 and 25. Claims 23 and 27, which each depend from at least one of claims 21 and 25, are allowable over the proposed combination of references for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 21 and 25.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 11, 2007

By: /Ross Dannenberg/  
Ross A. Dannenberg  
Registration No. 49,024

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001